Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-29 stand rejected. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication that claims 2, 6-7, 13-14 and 20-29 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that rewriting the allowable claims is unnecessary in view of the amendments and remarks set forth below.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicants have appropriately amended the claims and respectfully request therefore that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action sets forth at page 4, "Claims 1 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshioka et al. ('Yoshioka') U.S. Patent No. 5479173." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set for the below.

According to the Office, Yoshioka teaches most of the features of claims 1 and 19, including "means (13) for detecting trajectories, associated and in cooperation with the electronic system to vary the supervisory area to be covered by the capturing device as a function of second signals, processed and analyzed, obtained by said means for detecting trajectories." Office Action at page 4. Applicants respectfully disagree with this overly broad interpretation of Yoshioka.

According to Yoshioka, "means (13) for detecting trajectories" provide signals to a "danger level judgment section (15)" (see Fig. 1), or to "danger level judgment means", for judging a danger level as a function of the trajectory detected and of an area where an obstacle has been sensed. If the object sensed is in an area which matches a travelling passage and/or a deduced travelling passage, the danger level means determine a high, medium or low danger level.

Yoshioka does not disclose or suggest, however, varying a supervisory area to be covered by the capturing device, but carrying out an area sorting, the areas being

classified by danger levels, and thus discriminating the objects detections according to which of the areas the objects have been detected in.

The Office readily admits that Yoshioka "fails to explicitly teach varying the coverage area as a function of second signals processed and analyzed by the trajectories detecting means", but its "teachings suggest to vary the output signals in order to adapt to different environment depending **on the collision level detected**". (Emphasis added) Applicants respectfully disagree with the latter conclusion.

First, the present invention does not refer at all to carrying out an area sorting classified by danger levels, and thus discriminating the objects detections according to which of said areas they have been detected in. Neither does it describe varying a supervisory area "depending on the collision level detected."

Rather, applicants' claimed invention varies the supervisory area according to the detected trajectory along which the vehicle is running, i.e. if it is circulating on a curved path. It proposes to cover only the varied supervisory area in order to detect objects within, but not to monitor other areas and give them different danger levels. The areas which are not the varied supervisory area are not monitored.

Another difference with Yoshioka is that in Yoshioka an object is detected and afterwards it is determined if the object is in an area of a high danger level or not. By contrast, in applicants' claimed invention, the supervisory area is varied to cover the most likely place to find an object to be detected, but the presence or absence of any object in the area does not influence the supervisory area variation. I.e., the invention proposed and described in claims 1 and 19, does not refer to a method or system which operates after an object has been detected, deciding if it is in an area of a high or of a low danger level, but rather to a method and system which operates before the object detection, and in order to assure the object detection, by varying the area to be supervised, when the system "knows" that, for example if it is travelling a left curve, a vehicle circulating behind won't be occupying the same relative position with respect to the vehicle carrying the detection system than it was occupying before entering the curved path. Thus, the supervisory area must be different, and it is properly varied according to the invention proposed by the objected application.

In other words, applicants' claimed invention is a detection system comprising means for varying a supervisory area as a function of signals provided by means for

detecting trajectories, in order to adapt the area to cover the most likely place to find an object to be detected. In support of this, applicants respectfully direct attention to Figs. 1 and 2 of the application, where the object is a car and the supervisory area is that enclosed by the joined white lines, which is considerably varied from Fig. 1 to Fig. 2, according to a corresponding trajectory variation of the vehicle carrying the detection system (in this example the trajectory variation is a left curve path).

In the present invention the collision level detected does not influence the supervisory area variation. The exit signals generated by the electronic system (4) after processing first input signals obtained through a capturing device (1), are warning signals which have no influence in the supervisory area variation proposed. The processing, by the electronic system (4), of the signals obtained through the means for detecting trajectories (2) (named "second signals"), are the signals which after been processed by the electronic system (4) make the latter to vary the supervisory area.

Applicants submit therefore that the rejection of claims 1 and 19 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Claim 2-18 and 20-29 ultimately depend on either claim 1 or 19 and, thus, are likewise not subject to rejection for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 19.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicant(s)

JLE/kpc

Dated: December 26, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA on December 26, 2007.